1979

Complaint 13 H

June 26, 1979

Mrs. Robert Trish

Dear Mrs. Irish:

Your complaint of noxious fumes from a barge cleaning operation located on the Oyster Creek Intracoastal Canal was investigated on June 13, 1979.

· 2、10年,《西德勒·勒德·勒·斯·德·利。

The barge cleaning facility, Gulfco Incorporated, formerly Chromalloy, Gulfco Division, was visited and the manager, Mr. Tom Randolph admits that the potential for such odor does exist at his facility, but denies any operations on the date of the complaint which could have been responsible.

While I am unable to state with any certainty that the odor you experienced did not come from this facility, neither was I able to confirm that it did.

If you should experience a recurrence of the malodor, any other air pollution problem, or if you have any questions regarding this investigation, please feel free to contact me at this office.

Yours truly,

V)

Charley Sims, S.E.T. Med Charley Sims, S.E.T. Engineering Technician

sh

bcc: File, Board, Compliance

June 26, 1979

Mrs. Robert Irish

Dear Mrs. Irish:

Your complaint of noxious fumes from a barge cleaning operation located on the Oyster Creek Intracoastal Canal was investigated on June 13, 1979.

The barge cleaning facility, Gulfco Incorporated, formerly Chromalloy, Gulfco Division, was visited and the manager, Mr. Tom Randolph admits that the potential formsuch odor does exist at his facility, but denies any operations on the date of the complaint which could have been responsible.

While I am unable to state with any certainty that the odor you experienced did not come from this facility, neither was I able to confirm that it did.

If you should experience a recurrence of the malodor, any other air pollution problem, or if you have any questions regarding this investigation, please feel free to contact me at this office.

Yours truly,

W)

Charley Sims, S.E.T. Mill In Engineering Technician

sh

bcc: File, Board, Compliance

ACCOUNT NUMBER BL-0016-H TEXAS AIR CONTROL BOARD SOURCE INVESTIGATION SYSTEM Date of Investigation 06 ,13 , 79 01 Action Code County Brazoria Jurisdiction 070 Source Status: AA EX 🗌 Company Name, Location, Mailing Address Facility Type Enter Y or N in each box 02 Gulfco Inc. Portable Unit 03 County Road 756, North of SH 332 Significant Federal Facility P O Drawer O 🏗 Freeport, Texas 77541 NESHAPS **EPA Major Source EPA Minor Source** Group 39

Business/ Shipyard Fabrication & Repair
Products 122 10 INVESTIGATIONS: Agency Comment _____ Alternate Method _______ Burning Permit 19 20 (Permit No.) Complaint 1 NSPS 29 NESHAPS____ Observed Sample _____ Sampling _____ Rule 7&8______ SIP ____ Source Surveillance ___ Other ___ Management Tom Randolph Title Mgr., Marine Operation Phone 713)233 Title Yard Superintendent 60 Complaint No. 0.72357 Date Received 0.6 1279 Odor X Smoke X Dust X Other X Smoke X Dust X Dust X Other X Dust X Complaint No. Date Received 16 22 Smoke 33 Dust 34 Other 35 Findings: Confirmed Unconfirmed X Odor ___ Smake Dust Other Cause REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLES Sampling Results To Follow: Yes **Pollutant** Actual 16 i3 25 37 32 37 41 49 51 59 61 64 16 16 25 37 37 41 49 51 59 61 64 32 37 41 49 51 59 61 64 Emission Rate Code: lb/hr-01; lb/D-02; T/Y-03; SCFM-04; PPM-05; PPB-06; ug/M3-07; GR/SCF-08; lb/MBTU-09; %-10; None-11 19 Emissions' Status: 🦾 In Compliance 🔲 Noncompliance 🔲 Short-Term Noncompliance Partial Operation | Needs | Upset or Maintenance | Other | 24 | Other | 47 20 Violations: Rule Rule TCAA TCAA Source Source Source Source te / Formaniki Chromalloy, Gulfco Div. 24 PA SO WAS 37 COM 42 UNC 49 CON 54 UNC 61 CON 66 69 UNC 76 CON 25 Campliance Action Recommended: Yes Abatement Letter Sent: Yes Emissions Inventory Form Needed: Yes D No X El accurate: Yes No 21 Undetermined X Photos: Yes No X Permits: Approve Oeny Exempt Hald Oiscuss Engineer

nvestigator(s)

Page ._ 1 _ of ____ Pages

6/13/79 BL-0016-H Page 2

On 6/13/79, an investigation of a complaint of malodor (#072357) was conducted at this facility.

The complainant related that the odor was noted on 6/11/79 at approximately 2000 hours and was continuous for a least three hours. The odor was attributed to the Gulfco barge-cleaning facility because of the wind direction and was confirmed by the complainant to be emanating from the northeast side of the intercoastal water canal.

While the complainant was aware of a barge cleaning operation in the area, the name of the company was not known. Local investigation confirms that Gulfco, Inc., formerly Chromalloy, Gulfco Division, is the only barge cleaning facility in the immediate vicinity and could have been the source of the alleged nuisance odor based on the wind direction.

According to Mr. Tom Randolph, Manager Marine Operations, and Mr. Charles Tanner, Yard Superintendent and Personnel and Safety Director, Chromalloy has recently divested Gulfco from its operation. The Gulfco operation is much smaller in sale than the previous operation, but is still as significant from a nuisance standpoint. The barge cleaning and repair operation involves the removal of all liquid residue, and salvage of as much of this material as possible. Internal cleaning of the barges which have contained various liquids, mostly aromatic hydrocarbons and frequently quite odorous, is generally accomplished with a cold water detergent washdown. On some occasions hot water is used, and when specified and furnished by the customer, solvents such as perchloroethylene are used. (When solvents such as this are used, the used solvent is also collected for salvage).

All salvaged hydrocarbons are stored in solid roof tanks. Five tanks are available and an attempt is made to segregate according to compatability. The used detergent and water is placed into wastewater ponds. There are three evaporation ponds; number one is 0.54 acres in size and is the principle receiving pond; number three is 1.2 acres in size and receives effluent from number one; number two is 0.5 acres in size and is an alternate of number one. Pond number three contains a mechanical aerator which was not operating at the time of the investigation.

The more volatile hydrocarbon residuals contained in the detergent wash probably evaporate rather quickly as they are added to pond number one (There is an air gap of approximately one foot to 18 inches between the end of the pipe and surface of the pond.) The less-volatile hydrocarbons accumulate on top of the pond, while the water drains into pond number three.

There was a fairly heavy accumulation of thick hydrocarbons floating on pond number one, and much smaller quantities on the surface of number three. According to the management, the surface of number one is currently being skimmed and vacuumed-off. The truck was not present during the investigation and, according to the management, was not working the pond last Monday, the day of the complaint.

At the time of the investigation, a northeast wind was blowing. There were fairly strong odors from the evaporation ponds within close proximity, however, the odor was not noticeable at a nearly commercial marina downwind from the ponds.

Investigator's Comments Gulfco, Inc. Freeport, Brazoria Co., Texas 6/13/79 BL-0016-H Page 2

According to Mr. Tanner, the facility normally operates only one shift per day. If required, employees may work overtime after a short break until approximately 2000 hours. He stated that he could check to see if any overtime was worked last Monday, if requested, but it would take some time. He further stated that on Montay only one barge, which had contained caustic and was not odorous, had been cleaned.

in recent years the complaints involving this facility have consisted mostly of dust from sandblasting. The complainant indicates that there had been only one other incident of significant odor and that not recently. It is quite possible that the alleged odor did emanate from this facility, however, I was unable to establish any activity at the site at the time of alleged occurrence. Since a similar wind direction existed on the date of the investigation as was reported during the time of the complaint, and no nuisance odor was experienced, fam reluctant to confirm a nuisance condition. It does seem apparent however, that a strong nuisance potential does exist and the barge cleaning activity appears to be more prevalent now than previously noted according to investigative comments in the files.

Charley Sims, S.E.T. Engineering Technician

sh